58715-6.2-F

Present Condition of the Sheltered Homeless Population: Wisconsin 1985

Julie Bock
Clare Stapleton Concord
Urban Information Consultants

Prepared for Division of Community Services
Department of Health and Social Services
State of Wisconsin

PRESENT CONDITION OF THE SHELTERED HOMELESS POPULATION: WISCONSIN 1985.

Introduction

Planning programatic initiatives for the homeless population of Wisconsin presents difficulties because, to date, there has been no statewide attempt to systematically assess the situation of the homeless population. The documentation of the number of persons who are homeless is perhaps not as important as other information such as the accessibility, cost, and conditions under which emergency shelter is provided. Obtaining such information is critical to assessing both the nature of the homeless problem and the capacity of agencies to respond appropriately. This research attempts to to establish a statewide data base on emergency shelter to assist in policy planning for the homeless population.

A survey designed to collect a common set of information on programs which provide shelter directly or indirectly (through vouchers etc), was sent to all known providers in Wisconsin. The survey also sought provider's comments and opinions on the major unmet needs and recommendations that they might have on meeting those unmet needs.

Questionnaires (along with a stamped self addressed return envelopes)

were sent to 45 agencies identified as part of the Department of Health and Human Services program for shelter providers in Wisconsin. Subsequent telephone follow-up encouraged non-responding agencies to complete the survey. Second mailings were made when necessary. Some of the personnel who could provide the requested information were involved in meetings, working with clients, or unavailable due to part-time or variable work hours. Telephone interviews were necessary to secure responses from these providers. Although the survey was somewhat cumbersome to administer by telephone there appears to be little or no difference between the responses mailed back versus those obtained over the telephone.

There was only one absolute refusal to provide any information. The refusing agency in southeastern Wisconsin is religious in nature and provides an evening meal and shelter to males only. One other director refused to give any estimates of client characteristics because he did not want to provide any misleading information. This agency does not keep any records. The director believes that any inaccurate information could be detrimental to those who are homeless. In addition to these two agencies, two providers had ceased operation and two were excluded (because they provided specialized services which were beyond the scope of this project). Seven other agencies provided information and referral services only, and although their information contributes to the overall perspective of this report they are not included in the calculated statistics.

A word of caution is in order at the outset of this report. The majority of agencies did not have the kind of information and data the survey requested. While most agencies record some information, the majority keep little more than name, dates, precipitating events and occasionally demographic data. The reasons behind this lack of record keeping are varied but include the low number of persons served (in rural areas) and the lack of a monetary incentive (until recently perhaps) to maintain more complete programmatic data. Their meager budgets and underfunding of their programs combined with limited staff attempting to serve those with vast needs makes record keeping seem arbitrary and even to hinder these agencies overall goals.

There were however several providers who did keep detailed records. For these agencies, record keeping has become integral to their funding procedures; as a consequence they are able to provide reliable and reliable and accurate data. The majority of these programs are also troubled by the same staffing limitations and have the added burden of a larger clientele, but have learned that data collection frequently leads to funding on various levels. The majority of these programs are located in Madison and Milwaukee.

The estimates obtained both in writing and via telephone represent the best current picture of the situation in Wisconsin. The intensive effort necessary to collect the information does however speak to the need for a common statewide database if we are to have accurate information capable of delineating changes anc fluctuations over time

in the homeless population of Wisconsin.

Although it is essential to bear in mind that many of these figures are estimates, they are not without merit. The providers made informed approximations when exact information was unavailable. Notwithstanding the limitations, the information contained in this report begins to lay the foundation upon which future research can be constructed.

There were thirty-nine providers included in the survey. Of these 12 provided direct service (DSO in the following tables), 19 provided shelter vouchers (VO in the following tables), six agencies provided both direct services and voucher services (DSV in the following tables), and two provided voucher services with a prevention aspect (VP in the following tables). The VP group is unique in that they not only provide voucher services, but also utilize their funds in such a way as to assist in paying rents, energy assistance and the like in an attempt to keep persons in their homes or apartments rather than waiting for them to become "technically homeless" and then provide lodging in a hotel for a night or two. These programs are grounded on the belief that it is easier and more cost effective to assist people while they are still domiciled.

Detailed results of the Survey of Shelter Providers in Wisconsin

1. A. Does your program operate year-round? Yes____ No____

If "No" when does it operate? _____

B. Hours of operation: Day ____ Evening _____ Overnight_____

One commonality among all the programs was that all operate year around. There were however notable differences in the hours of operation.

(See notes below)	Total	DSO N=12	DS&V N=6	VO N=19	VP N=2
Day Only	2			2	
Evening Only	0				
Day and Evening Only	6			6*	
Evening and Overnight	5	3	2		
24 hours	25	9	3	11	2
Some coverage (all with 24 hour emergency cover)	7		1	6*	

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers of agencies
- Total: All providers
- DSO: Direct Service Providers Only
- DS&V: Direct Service and Voucher Providers
- VO: Voucher Providers Only
- VP: Voucher and Prevention
- *: These 6 agencies provide day and evening hours and some additional coverage.

As would be expected, the direct service providers including those who additionally provide vouchers generally operate 24 hours a day. The remaining providers are open during evening hours (after 7 pm) and overnight due to the high demand for night-time shelter. Six of the agencies had day and evening hours, but were also able to provide some form of 24 hour emergency coverage.

2. Do you serve (please check)

_____ males only
_____ females only
_____ families only
_____ males and females
_____ females and children

(See notes below)	Total	DSO N=12	DS&V N=6	VO N=19	VP N=2
No single males,but others	3	0	2	1	0
Males only	3	2	1	0	0
Females only	0	0	0	0	0
Males and Females only	2	2	0	0	0
Females and children	2	2	0	0	0
Families	35	6	9	18	2
Unaccompanied minors	0	0	0	0	0

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers of agencies
Total All providers
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Prevention

It is notable that there were no providers who served unaccompanied minors. Most of the agencies, while not providing shelter services, do provide unaccompanied minors with information and referral. This survey did not cover those providers directly targeting youth. Many youths who are homeless may find their way to runaway shelters and the like.

Also of note in the above table in the number of providers who serve families (more than one person in the group). Though many agencies do not target this group, services are for the most part available to families.

3. Please indicate the services which your program provides (or vouchers) to each of the specified types of clients:

	Provide Service			Provide Vouchers	
	Meals	Bed	Info/Referral	Meals	Bed
Single Adult Men					
Single Adult Women					
Unaccompanied Minors					
Women with Children					
Two-Parent Families					

With regard to meals, the typical pattern consisted of direct service providers offering meals on-site. Four of the direct service provider agencies that give vouchers for lodging also give vouchers for meals. All of the agencies that provide vouchers for lodging, provide vouchers for food as well. Only one provided meals directly in addition to their outside food sources. The two voucher/prevention programs also provided vouchers for meals.

Most agencies, whether direct service providers or those who provide vouchering services, indicated that they provide information and referral to everyone, regardless of their target population. Interestingly however, many reported that they rarely needed to do this because most clients were of the group(s) that the agency targeted, thus eliminating the need for information and referral services to non-targeted groups.

4. What percentages of your referrals of people who are homeless come from each of the following sources?

(See notes below)	DSO N=9	DS&V N=6	VO N=18	VP N=2
	%	%	%	%
community mental health programs	3	5	15	10
mental health hospitals	2	0	3	2
local Department of Social Services	19	29	25	33
police	15	7	20	15
other local governmental agencies	2	4	1	10
state agencies	3	1	0	0
private voluntary agencies	11	6	12	20
self referrals (walk-ins)	45	47	23	10
other (what?)	0	1	0	0

Notes: Figures in this table are percent of agency's clients
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Prevention

As the above table reveals there is a great similarity among the programs in terms of where referrals originate. Voucher programs appear to have a broader base of referrals when compared to direct service providers. The direct service providers have a much higher number of walk-ins (self-referals) than voucher programs.

What is not evident from the table is that the smaller communities rely on the police for referrals, especially during late night hours. In these communities it is frequently the police who first become aware of persons in need of shelter. The larger communities (and consequently those reporting higher numbers of people who are homeless) obtain the majority of their referrals as walk-ins or from local Departments of Social Services and private voluntary agencies.

5. If you provide shelter directly, please complete the following:

	Individuals Only	Families Only	Either	Total
Listed capacity (# beds)	563	111	35	709
The largest number you sheltered on one night in 1985	558	62	35	655
The smallest number you sheltered on one night in 1985	214	10	18	242
The average number you sheltered on one night in 1985	362	36	25	423

Note: Figures in this table are numbers of clients (summed over all responding agencies).

Two agencies did not provide shelter during 1985 and thus are not included in this tabulation. Obviously voucher programs are not included. Two agencies did not distinguish between family or individual beds. They accommodate both families and individuals according to the needs of the day.

Some qualifications need to be made as to the number of 'beds'. Some agencies included cots, chairs, blankets and pillows on the floor, in the definition of beds or capacity. Thus the number of 709 reflects the upper limit of 'beds' for those agencies participating in this survey. The tested capacity of 655 is perhaps a better estimate of actual capacity. There is no assumption that the 'beds' or the filled-to-capacity shelter would comply with health and building codes.

Additionally, sometimes agencies must double or triple-up children in a bed due to lack of space. While the upper limit of the available beds has not been met, large families sometimes go unserved due to the difficulty in matching large families with suitable accommodation. For example, on a given night a shelter may be almost full. A family of six is in need of shelter but there are only three beds. Rather than split the family up some parents choose to stay together but unsheltered. For others there is no choice because of the prohibitions against sheltering unaccompanied minors. Thus parents who may be willing to forgo shelter for themselves can not leave the children in a shelter because they would then be unaccompanied minors.

A further qualification as to the number of beds involves the availability of those beds to persons without shelter. For example, the Dane County facility in Madison is not available to men who are not eligible for general assistance nor is it available to women (g.a. eligible or not). Thus there is the real possibility of beds being empty while people sleep outdoors or in overfilled, but more

'available,' shelters.

6. If you purchase or arrange shelter, please complete the following:

	Individuals	Families	Either	Total
The maximum number of such spaces available on any one night in 1985	74	72	31	178
The largest number for whom you purchased such lodging on one night in 1985	132	65	24	221
The smallest number for whom you purchased such lodging on one night in 1985	11	8	10	29
The average number for whom you purchased such lodging on one night in 1985	47	16.5	17	80.5

Note: Figures in this table are numbers of clients (summed over all responding agencies).

While only four agencies combined all their data for this question (making no distinction between beds for individuals or for families) the overwhelming majority of agencies made an arbitrary distinction. Three agencies served only individuals for purchasing or arranging shelter. Three other agencies did not have funds available for vouchering beds in 1985. Most agencies stated that the maximum number was unlimited because they were uncertain how many beds would be available in the hotels they utilize. Many reported that the maximum number of beds available was contingent only on the agencies' available funds for vouchering.

Four agencies mentioned that they had a permanent bed or two reserved for them every night with a particular hotel or motel. Respondents saw two advantages to this kind of arrangement. First, it is a practical solution to the constant, frantic searching for a space to put someone up for the night. Secondly, providers were able to get greatly reduced rate by renting a room for a whole month rather than on a nightly basis.

Although voucher providers estimated that the maximum number of spaces available was 178, the largest number actually sheltered was 221. This dicrepency arises from some programs overspending their budgeted number of spaces. In effect agencies budgeted for a high of 178 spaces per night but expended funds for 221 on the highest night.

7. Of the persons you serve, what percentage are in each of the following income groups? (persons may not be in these groups, so total may not sum to 100%).

Persons in Families

(See notes below)	Total=33		DSO =7		DS&V =6		VO =18		VP = 2	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
a. No income	1481	45	390	56	150	25	866	49	75	38
b. General Assistance	338	10	65	9	55	9	208	12	10	5
c. AFDC	1279	39	235	34	320	53	614	34	110	55
d. SSI	48	1	0	0	35	6	13	1	0	0
e. Retirement/Pension	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
f. Social Security /Disability	27	1	10	1	20	3	2	0	5	2
g. Unemployment Compensation	92	3	0	0	17	3	75	4	0	0
h. Plasma Center	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
i. Other (specify)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Single Persons

(See notes below)	Total=33		DSO =7		DS&V =6		VO =18		VP = 2	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
a. No income	2137	58	647	59	260	43	1080	60	150	75
b. General Assistance	993	27	208	19	225	37	510	28	50	25
c. AFDC	64	2	14	1	0	0	50	3	0	0
d. SSI	159	4	76	7	68	11	15	0	0	0
e. Retirement/Pension	57	1	42	4	5	1	10	1	0	0
f. Social Security /Disability	149	4	58	5	35	6	56	3	0	0
g. Unemployment Compensation	102	3	25	2	2	0	75	4	0	0
h. Plasma Center	27	1	18	2	5	1	4	0	0	0
i. Other (specify)	9	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers and percent of clients. Some providers supplied numerical estimates while others supplied percentage information. Conversions were made on the basis of the estimated total population served.

Total	All providers
DSO	Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V	Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO	Voucher Providers Only
VP	Voucher and Prevention

The majority of agency respondents attempted to answer this question, but only a few actually ask this question of their clients. Many providers reported that numerous clients came for services when an entitlement benefit failed to arrive on time, but the overwhelming majority have no income upon arrival. The apparent trend as can be seen from the data is that families tend to have somewhat more money and are more often eligible for AFDC than general assistance. Single persons, on the other hand, have less income and secure general assistance when possible.

Agencies usually begin immediately to assist clients in the securing of applicable benefits whenever appropriate. The most notable aspect of this table is the number of people who arrive at the provider agency with no income whatsoever. Shelter providers are not usually prepared to deal with the substantial immediate needs of persons who are totally destitute.

8. Of the persons you serve, what percentage are in each of the following groups? (persons may not be in these groups, so total may not sum to 100%).

Persons in Families

(See notes below)	Total=31		DSO =6 (DK=2) (NA=4)		DS&V =5 (DK=1)		VO =18 (DK=1)		VP = 2	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
a. Mentally Disabled	289	9	110	15	122	26	57	3	0	0
b. Physically Disabled	51	2	10	1	10	2	11	1	20	10
c. Substance Abusers	395	12	110	15	140	30	145	8	0	0
d. Domestic Abuse Victim	504	16	79	11	140	30	245	13	40	20
e. Migrant/Seasonal Workers	99	3	25	3	20	4	54	3	0	0
f. None of the above	1854	58	381	53	35	7	1298	72	140	70

Single Persons

(See notes below)	Total=33		DSO =7		DS&V =6		VO =18		VP = 2	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
a. Mentally Disabled	716	20	295	26	162	32	254	14	5	2.5
b. Physically Disabled	76	2	52	5	17	3	2	.	5	2.5
c. Substance Abusers	965	26	401	36	174	34	365	20	25	12.5
d. Domestic Abuse Victim	117	3	51	4	6	1	60	3	0	0
e. Migrant/Seasonal Workers	185	5	40	3	25	5	115	6	5	2.5
f. None of the above	1585	43	276	26	121	24	1028	56	160	80.0

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers and percent of clients. Some providers supplied numerical estimates while others supplied percentage information. Conversions were made on the basis of the estimated total population served.

Total	All providers
DSO	Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V	Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO	Voucher Providers Only
VP	Voucher and Purchase

Most providers estimated their responses to this question. The most frequent response explaining "none of the above" was "just simply poor". While many persons are "just simply poor" there are significantly more families classed "just simply poor" than

individuals. The above table shows that individuals tend to have additional complexities in their lives such as poor mental health and actively abuse substances (primarily alcohol).

There is a marked contrast in the responses of agencies providing direct services and vouchers and those providing vouchers only. Both persons in families and single individuals with mental disabilities are much less likely to be seen by voucher only agencies. On the other hand these agencies tend to have more 'simply poor' persons in the population that they serve. To the extent that voucher only agencies tend to be the only source of emergency shelter in the more rural counties, this finding may suggest at least three alternatives. First that persons with mental disability are not as vulnerable to loss of their housing in these areas. Second that the person who is homeless and mentally disabled is not in the agency's target group in terms of emergency shelter. Third, that these agencies in assigning priorities to those whom it will serve place the 'simply poor' above those with more complex problems.

9. What percentages of the persons you serve are in more than one of the above groups? (Mentally Disabled, Physically Disabled, Substance Abusers, Domestic Abuse Victim, Migrant/Seasonal Workers, None of the above (simply poor)).

The majority of agencies were quick to point out overlapping categories, but only about half of respondents attempted to estimate percentages of the most frequent combinations. There were a few agencies however that were able to make fairly clear delineating distinctions. For all agencies reporting persons overlapping several categories, the most frequently occurring combination were those in the categories of mentally disabled and substance abusers.

This finding was most prevalent among those agencies that provide direct services only and in agencies that provide direct services in addition to vouchers. The programs only providing vouchers reported a more frequent combination of substance abusers and other (poor and unemployed). For these agencies persons in the categories "mentally disabled" and "substance abusers" appeared in a relatively distant second position, both in terms of overall agencies reporting this combination and the percentages reported. The data available on the two voucher programs is very minimal, but those persons being served tended to be either poor/unemployed and substance abusers, or poor/unemployed and victims of domestic violence.

Perhaps the major distinction between the various types of service providers was the disproportionate number of persons with mental disability and another problem reported by direct service providers. No other providers reported this combination with such frequency, or as higher proportion as the direct service providers.

10. Of the persons that you serve, what percentage are:

Persons in Families

	Total NA/DK=8 N=31	DSO N=7 NA/DK=7	DS&V N=6 NA/DK=0	VC N=16 NA/DK=1	VP N=2 NA/DK=0
A. Female	1899(63%)	365(73%)	365(61%)	1034(61%)	135(67.5%)
B. Male	1101(37%)	135(27%)	235(39%)	666(39%)	65(32.5%)

Single Persons

	Total N=39	DSO N=12 NA/DK=0	DS&V N=6 NA/DK=0	VO N=19 NA/DK=0	VP N=2 NA/DK=0
A. Female	1027(29%)	437(36%)	172(29%)	398(22%)	20(10%)
B. Male	2746(71%)	763(64%)	428(71%)	1402(78%)	180(90%)

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers and percent of clients. Some providers supplied numerical estimates while others supplied percentage information. Conversions were made on the basis of the estimated total population served.

Total All providers
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VC Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Purchase

Some agencies kept their records so intertwined that it was difficult and sometimes impossible for them to distinguish differences between those in families or as individuals. However the majority of agencies were able to report exact differences as it pertained to this question.

The ratio of females to males varies not so much by the type of service provider, but rather by the the grouping 'persons-in-families' or 'single persons'. Among persons in family groupings, the number of females is much higher than in the population of homeless single persons.

11. Of the persons who are homeless that you serve, what percentages are in each of the following racial/ethnic groups?

Persons in Families

	Total NA/DK=10 N=29	DSO N=7 NA/DK=5	DS&V N=5 NA/DK=1	VO N=15 NA/DK=4	VP N=2 NA/DK=0
a. Black	632(22%)	229(33%)	161(32%)	202(13%)	40(20%)
b. White	2027(70%)	417(60%)	308(62%)	1152(77%)	150(75%)
c. Hispanic	143(5%)	33(5%)	24(5%)	76(5%)	10(5%)
d. Asian	38(1%)	8(1%)	2(<1%)	28(2%)	0(0%)
e. Native American	48(2%)	7(1%)	4(1%)	36(2%)	0(0%)
f. Other	10(<1%)	5(<1%)	0(0%)	5(1%)	0(0%)

Single Persons

	Total N=43 NA/DK=3	DSO N=18 NA/DK=1	DS&V N=5 NA/DK=1	VO N=18 NA/DK=1	VP N=2 NA/DK=0
a. Black	618(17%)	331(30%)	49(9%)	188(10%)	50(25%)
b. White	2663(74%)	680(62%)	404(81%)	1434(80%)	145(73%)
c. Hispanic	166(5%)	55(5%)	21(5%)	87(5%)	3(2%)
d. Asian	38(1%)	9(1%)	7(1%)	21(1%)	1(<1%)
e. Native American	94(3%)	19(2%)	14(3%)	60(3%)	1(<1%)
f. Other	15(<1%)	5(<1%)	5(1%)	5(1%)	0(0%)

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers and percent of clients. Some providers supplied numerical estimates while others supplied percentage information. Conversions were made on the basis of the estimated total population served.

Total All providers
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Prevention

The racial/ethnic mix in the people served was consistent accross various types of service providers. This finding holds-up even when controlling for the disparate sample sizes. The racial/ethnic backgrounds of the homeless population, evident from the above tables, mirror the overall geographical groupings within the state. In other words, in the northern parts of Wisconsin providers serve primarily

Whites and some Native Americans and Hmong/Asian persons. The highest concentrations of minorities in the homeless population occur in the southern portion of Wisconsin.

While the geographic pattern of minorities parallels that in the general population there is an over-representation of all minority groups when compared to the 1980 United States Census Profile for Wisconsin. Census data indicated that Whites comprise 94 percent of the state's population, with the next largest group being Blacks at four percent. The following table summarizes this over-representation.

	Whites	Blacks	Other Minorities
1980 Census	94%	4%	2%
1985 Sheltered Homeless Persons			
In Families	70%	22%	8%
Single Persons	74%	17%	9%

12. Of the persons who are homeless that you serve, what percentages are in each of the following age groups?

Males

	Total NA/DK=2 N=37	DSO N=10 NA/DK=1	DS&V N=6 NA/DK=0	VO N=18 NA/DK=1	VP N=2 NA/DK=0
a. Under 18	260(7%)	10(1%)	101(17%)	149(8%)	0(0%)
b. 18-25	1040(28%)	226(21%)	165(27%)	629(34%)	20 10%)
c. 26-30	1188(32%)	426(39%)	218(36%)	524(28%)	20(10%)
d. 31-60	1161(31%)	380(35%)	107(18%)	514(28%)	160(80%)
e. Over 60	86(2%)	48(4%)	9(2%)	29(2%)	0 0%)

Females

	Total NA/DK=3 N=36	DSO N=10 NA/DK=2	DS&V N=6 NA/DK=0	VO N=18 NA/DK=1	VP N=2 NA/DK=0
a. Under 18	277(8%)	17(2%)	75(12%)	185(11%)	0(0%)
b. 18-25	1102(31%)	237(24%)	215(36%)	640(37%)	10(5%)
c. 26-30	1029(29%)	385(39%)	170(28%)	464(27%)	10(5%)
d. 31-60	1062(30%)	337(34%)	135(23%)	410(24%)	180(90%)
e. Over 60	33(1%)	14(1%)	5(1%)	14 1%)	0(0%)

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers and percent of clients. Some providers supplied numerical estimates while others supplied percentage information. Conversions were made on the basis of the estimated total population served.

Total All providers
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Prevention

The ages of the recipients was very consistent across various service providers. The majority of agencies had difficulty separating out the ages of males versus females, but frequently reported that they believed them to be equivalent. Based on various data records the best estimates yielded the above table which indicates little difference in ages between the sexes.

13. If the racial/ethnic or the age/sex percentages among clients you serve are different for certain "special needs groups", please indicate such differences on a separate sheet of paper (for example: if the substance abusers are nearly all teenagers, or the mentally disabled are more likely to be over age 60).

Insufficient responses were obtained to make any meaningful statements about this question.

14. Please estimate the percentage of your clients who are homeless and in the following categories:

a. Those requiring organized or institutional support programs (e.g., because of mental disability)
b. Those requiring limited support or cash assistance, not ready to take a job (e.g., untrained young mother with child)
c. Those temporarily homeless for economic reasons, needing a job but employable (e.g., a recently unemployed auto worker)

	Total N=39	DSO N=19	DS&V N=6	VO N=12	VP N=2
a.	627(16%)	232(12%)	171(28%)	209(18%)	15(7.5%)
b.	1541(40%)	788(42%)	235(39%)	453(38%)	65(32.5%)
c.	1707(44%)	880(46%)	194(32%)	513(44%)	120(60%)

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers and percent of clients. Some providers supplied numerical estimates while others supplied percentage information. Conversions were made on the basis of the estimated total population served.

Total	All providers
DSO	Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V	Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO	Voucher Providers Only
VP	Voucher and Prevention

Many respondents felt the need to qualify their answers to this question. They noted that these figures are all estimates and that some individuals fell into two categories - which were viewed as not mutually exclusive. In addition some providers believe that there is great disparity between families and individuals as it pertains to this questions.

In general the consensus of providers was that families tend to be in categories "c" and "b" respectively (and seldom in "a"). Thus providers saw families that were homeless due to the recent recession or to long term unemployment as a consequence of restructuring of the economy. Providers viewed individuals as more likely to be in category "a", but also in categories "b" and "c".

15. Do you ask your clients why they are homeless?

	Total N=36 NA/DK=2	DSO N=11 NA/DK=1	DSV N=6 NA/DK=0	VO N=18 NA/DK=0	VP N=1 NA/DK=1
Yes = 36		10	6	18	1
No = 0					

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers and percent of clients. Some providers supplied numerical estimates while others supplied percentage information. Conversions were made on the basis of the estimated total population served.

Total	All providers
DSO	Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V	Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO	Voucher Providers Only
VP	Voucher and Prevention

Every provider elicits an answer, (directly, or indirectly) to this question. Often this occurs in an informal fashion. Because providers do elicit this information from each of their clients, their responses to the later questions on the causes of their clients homelessness can be viewed with some confidence.

16. Do you ask your clients where they came from?

	Total N=37 NA/DK=1	DSO N=11 NA/DK=1	DSV N=6 NA/DK=0	VO N=18 NA/DK=0	VP N=2 NA/DK=1
Yes	35	11	5	17	2
No	1	0	1	0	0
Depends on if it is an individual or family	1			1	

Again, because providers do elicit this information from each of their clients, their responses to the later questions on the source of their clients can be viewed with some confidence.

17. Prior to their becoming homeless, where did your clients live? Please estimate the percentage of your clients for each category:

	Total N=37 NA/DK=2	DSO N=11 NA/DK=1	DSV N=6 NA/DK=0	VO N=18 NA/DK=1	VP N=2 NA/DK=0
Lived:					
a. independently	2158(58%)	753(68%)	325(54%)	910(50.5%)	170(85%)
b. other's housing	945(26%)	231(21%)	134(22%)	550(30.5%)	30(15%)
c. institution	281(8%)	80(7%)	81(14%)	120(7%)	0(0%)
d. other passing through	316(8%)	36(3%)	60(10%)	220(12%)	0(0%)

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers and percent of clients. Some providers supplied numerical estimates while others supplied percentage information. Conversions were made on the basis of the estimated total population served.

Total	All providers
DSO	Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V	Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO	Voucher Providers Only
VP	Voucher and Prevention

Numerous service providers noted that this question was quite difficult to answer especially for those who have been homeless for a considerable period of time. The "other" category was consistently answered as "just passing through", though some implied that these persons fit into categories "a" or "b", others commented that persons "just passing through" had been chronically homeless and providers did not know (nor did they ask) where they had last lived.

18. Where do your clients come from? Please estimate the percentage of your clients for each category:

	Total N=39 NA/DK=0	DSO N=12 NA/DK=0	DSV N=6 NA/DK=0	VO N=19 NA/DK=0	VP N=2 NA/DK=0
a. Own town or city	2151(54%)	725(61%)	335(56%)	819(43%)	180(90%)
b. Other own county	779(20%)	223(19%)	124(21%)	412(22%)	20(10%)
c. Other Wisconsin	507(13%)	105(9%)	78(13%)	324(17%)	0(0%)
d. Non-Wisconsin	540(13%)	132(11%)	63(10%)	345(18%)	0(0%)

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers and percent of clients. Some providers supplied numerical estimates while others supplied percentage information. Conversions were made on the basis of the estimated total population served.

Total	All providers
DSO	Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V	Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO	Voucher Providers Only
VP	Voucher and Prevention

The majority of agencies provide services to those who are from their own town or city. Almost three quarters of persons are from the county in which the provider is located. It is the voucher-only programs that serve the more mobile individuals and families than other types of providers.

This local pattern of homelessness is typical of states without very large cities. People who are homeless tend to have little or no resources so are unlikely to be able to travel. Indeed some of the voucher-only programs commented that the out-of-town person was usually on the way to a definite destination (often family or job oriented), when they ran out of funds or were otherwise stranded. A study of one shelter (in Madison in the winter of 1984-85) indicated that the majority of people who were from out-of-state nonetheless had strong connections with Wisconsin (usually they were born or grew up in Wisconsin).

19. What do you think was the primary cause of the client's becoming homeless? Please estimate the percentage of your clients for each category:

	Total N=37 NA/DK=2	DSO N=11 NA/DK=1	DSV N=6 NA/DK=0	VO N=18 NA/DK=1	VP N=2 NA/DK=0
a. evicted by landlord	1523(41%)	464(42%)	205(34%)	724(40%)	130(65%)
b. evicted by primary tenant in whose unit the person lived	595(16%)	146(13%)	117(20%)	292(16%)	40(20%)
c. destruction of housing unit	45 3%)	35(3%)	5(1%)	55(3%)	0(0%)
d. family disruption	686(19%)	209(19%)	155(26%)	292(16%)	30(15%)
e. discharge from mental health facility	155(4%)	60(5%)	26(4%)	69(4%)	0(0%)
f. discharge from detox facility	129(3%)	45(4%)	36(6%)	48(3%)	0(0%)
g. discharge from other institution (prison etc)	176(5%)	85(8%)	36(6%)	55(3%)	0(0%)
h. other- poor no money	340(9%)	55(5%)	20(3%)	265(15%)	0(05)

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers and percent of clients. Some providers supplied numerical estimates while others supplied percentage information. Conversions were made on the basis of the estimated total population served.

Total	All providers
DSO	Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V	Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO	Voucher Providers Only
VP	Voucher and Prevention

Many providers indicated that most people are not actually evicted by either a landlord or by a primary tenant. The actual predecessor is lack of income to pay the rent, thus forcing them to leave. So, while most indicated categories "a", "b" and "h", the real factor was being

poor and having to move on - to somewhere else. Family disruption was frequently cited as associated with lack of money.

In examining precipitating events it is important to look at the process of becoming homeless. For example, although destruction of housing unit or discharge from any type of institution accounted for 17 percent of the overall total, this figure may be an underestimate, given the element of 'time'. Thus, someone may have had their housing unit destroyed, prompting them to move in with a relative or friend until conditions necessitate that they "move-on". Likewise discharge from an institution may be part of a process which also involves loss of benifits and subsequent eviction for non-payment of rent. Unemployment, underemployment and delayed entitlement checks all contribute to finding oneself without a place to stay. The precipitating event may be eviction, by landlord, friends or family, but the underlying cause is destitution.

III. PROGRAM FEATURES

20. What geographic area serves as your agency's "catchment"?

	Total N=39 NA/DK=0	DSO N=12 NA/DK=0	DSV N=6 NA/DK=0	VO N=19 NA/DK=0	VP N=2 NA/DK=0
City Only	4(10%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	4(21%)	0(0%)
County	23(59%)	9(75%)	3(50%)	10(53%)	1(50%)
Multiple WI Counties	6(15%)	0(0%)	2(33%)	3(16%)	1(50%)
WI County & Border State County	2(5%)	1(8%)	0(0%)	1(5%)	0(0%)
Unlimited	4(10%)	2(17%)	1(17%)	1(5%)	0(0%)

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers of agencies.

Total All providers
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Prevention

The majority of agencies focus on providing services to persons from their own counties.

21. List unduplicated count of persons receiving shelter in 1985 _____

	Total N=37 NA/DK=2	DSO N=11 NA/DK=1	DSV N=5 NA/DK=1	VO N=19 NA/DK=0	VP N=2 NA/DK=0
	17,763	6,353	8,515	2,584	311

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers of clients.

Total All providers
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Prevention

Some clarification is necessary when examining the above data. The unduplicated count of persons was probably higher than the figure cited above. A few of the agencies estimated their figures, because while they record the number of shelter nights, they did not always have unduplicated counts of individuals. They were asked to be as accurate as possible, underestimating rather than overestimating. Other constraints include the fact that one direct service only provider

agency does not keep any records on those individuals who utilize the overflow facilities. Thus, the potential for the actual figure to be significantly higher must be considered.

The overflow capacity during the coldest winter months is considerable, at eighty persons per night. Additionally, some agencies compile data based on the number of families, not necessarily the number of individuals. These facilities were asked to multiply the average family size by the number of families to obtain a figure comparable to others. Several providers objected on the basis that this was 'deflating' their figures because many families are considerably larger than the average and family size in general is getting larger.

Two agencies were not operating during 1985 and are reflected in the NA/DK category. Some of the voucher only and voucher-prevention programs provide rental assistance, energy assistance and the like. The above figures however do <u>not</u> include these persons.

Thus, the figure of 17,763 is a very conservative figure.

In estimating the number of persons in need of emergency shelter it is necessary to also consider the numbers refused shelter and those who do not seek shelter or who do not know where to go for assistance in obtaining shelter. Estimates of this hidden population are hard to make because of the difficulty in verifying information. Some estimates that have been made use a ratio between the sheltered population and those unsheltered. Ratios range from 1 to about 1.5 for localities that have emergency shelter services. Thus the number of un-sheltered people in localities that have emergency shelter facilities can be estimated at between approximately 18,000 and 27,000.

22. Do you provide shelter without charge to the client?

	Total N=39 NA/DK=0	DSO N=12	DSV N=6	VO N=19	VP N=2
Yes	38	11	6	19	2
No	1	1	0	0	0

Notes: The figures in this table are numbers of agencies.

Total All providers
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Prevention

All but one agency provides shelter without charge to clients.

23. Do you accept vouchers to pay for guest's shelter
If "Yes", which agencies provide shelter vouchers?

	Total N=39 NA/DK=0	DSO N=12	DSV N=6	VO N=19	VP N=2
Yes	5	3	1	1	0
No	34	9	5	18	2

Notes: The figures in this table are numbers of agencies.

Total All providers
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Prevention

The majority of agencies (87 percent) do not accept vouchers to pay for guest's shelter. The few that did relied either on a particular Salvation Army, a particular Unified Services Board, or on the Dane County Social Services Department.

24. For each of the following services, please indicate whether your clients need the services, whether you provide or arrange for the service, and if you consider it a major unmet need.

Total:All providers (N=39)	Needed	Provide/Arrange	Major Unmet Need
Showers	22(9%)	37(11%)	3(3%)
Meals	22(9%)	37(11%)	3(3%)
Clothing	22(9%)	36(11%)	2(2%)
Housing Referral	22(9%)	32(10%)	22(19%)
Educational Services	17(7%)	17(5%)	12(11%)
Job Training/Counseling	20(8%)	22(7%)	21(18%)
Mental Health Services	20(8%)	26(8%)	16(14%)
Medical Services	20(8%)	19(6%)	10(9%)
Child Care	16(7%)	15(4%)	9(8%)
Info. on General Assistance	21(9%)	33(10%)	5(4%)
Advocacy	21(9%)	22(7%)	6(5%)
General (Info and Referral)	18(7%)	33(10%)	1(<1%)
Other	2(1%)	1(<1%)	4(4%)

Direct Service Providers Only (N=12)	Needed	Provide/Arrange	Major Unmet Need
Showers	12(9%)	12(11%)	0(0%)
Meals	12(9%)	12(11%)	1(3%)
Clothing	12(9%)	12(11%)	0(0%)
Housing Referral	12(9%)	12(11%)	5(13%)
Educational Services	11(8%)	6(6%)	3(8%)
Job Training/Counseling	12(9%)	8(7%)	7(19%)
Mental Health Services	12(9%)	7(6%)	8(22%)
Medical Services	12(9%)	7(6%)	5(13%)
Child Care	9(6%)	6(6%)	3(8%)
Info. on General Assistance	12(9%)	10(9%)	2(8%)
Advocacy	11(8%)	8(7%	1(3%)
General (Info and Referral)	10(7%)	9(8%)	0(0%)
Other	1(<1%)	0(0%)	2(8%)

Direct Service and Voucher Providers (N=6)	Needed	Provide/Arrange	Major Unmet Need
Showers	5(9%)	5(11%)	1(4%)
Meals	5(9%)	5(11%)	1(4%)
Clothing	5(9%)	4(9%)	0(0%)
Housing Referral	5(9%)	4(9%)	5(23%)
Educational Services	4(7%)	2(4%)	2(9%)
Job Training/Counseling	5(9%)	3(6%)	1(4%)
Mental Health Services	5(9%)	4(9%)	2(9%)
Medical Services	4(7%)	3(6%)	2(9%)
Child Care	4(7%)	2(4%)	2(9%)
Info. on General Assistance	5(9%)	5(11%)	2(9%)
Advocacy	5(9%)	4(9%)	3(14%)
General (Info and Referral)	5(9%)	5(11%)	1(5%)
Other	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)

Voucher Providers Only (N=19)	Needed	Provide/Arrange	Major Unmet Need
Showers	16(9%)	18(12%)	1(2%)
Meals	16(9%)	18(12%)	1(2%)
Clothing	16(9%)	18(12%)	1(2%)
Housing Referral	16(9%)	14(9%)	10(22%)
Educational Services	14(8%)	8(5%)	6(13%)
Job Training/Counseling	14(8%)	9(6%)	11(24%)
Mental Health Services	14(8%)	13(8%)	6(13%)
Medical Services	15(8%)	9(6%)	3(7%)
Child Care	14(8%)	6(4%)	2(4%)
Info. on General Assistance	15(8%)	16(10%)	0(0%)
Advocacy	15(8%)	8(5%)	2(4%)
General (Info and Referral)	16(9%)	17(11%)	0(0%)
Other	1(<1%)	1(<1%)	2(4%)

Voucher and Prevention (N=2)	Needed	Provide/Arrange	Major Unmet Need
Showers	2(8%)	2(10%)	1(10%)
Meals	2(8%)	2(10%)	0(0%)
Clothing	2(8%)	2(10%)	1(10%)
Housing Referral	2(8%)	2(10%)	2(20%)
Educational Services	2(8%)	1(5%)	1(10%)
Job Training/Counseling	2(8%)	2(10%)	2(20%)
Mental Health Services	2(8%)	2(10%)	0(0%)
Medical Services	2(8%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Child Care	2(8%)	1(5%)	2(20%)
Info. on General Assistance	2(8%)	2(10%)	1(10%)
Advocacy	2(8%)	2(10%)	0(0%)
General (Info and Referral)	2(8%)	2(10%)	0(0%)
Other	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)

Note The figures in this table are numbers of agencies.

25. a. Is there a limit on the length of time persons may stay in your shelter? If yes, how many nights?

	Total N=39	DSO N=12	DSV N=6	VO N=19	VP N=2
No (# of agencies)	9(23%)	6	0	2	1
Yes (# of agencies)	30(77%)	6	6	17	1
Shelters with limits	**Total N=30**	**DSO N=6**	**DSV N=6**	**VO N=17**	**VP N=1**
Ave. # nights	13	21	24	4	3
Range # nights	1 to no limit	7-180	3-90	1-15	3 to no limit
Is the time limit ever exceeded?					
Yes (# of agencies)	25(83%)	5	5	15	0
No (# of agencies)	5(17%)	1	1	2	1

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers of agencies.

Total	All providers
DSO	Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V	Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO	Voucher Providers Only
VP	Voucher and Prevention

Overall the average length of stay is 13 days. This figure is considerably higher for direct service providers; it is considerably lower for voucher providers. Most voucher programs are limited by the lack of funding and thus must curtail whatever activities they might wish to provide. Only one program reported a restriction in the number of nights they could provide services to a particular person or group of persons as mandated by governmental regulations.

Although the majority of agencies set limits on the number of days one can stay (77 percent), of those, 83 percent make exceptions usually based on an individual case need. Specific instances noted included those whose benefits or funds have been delayed; those waiting for permanent housing; large families; those who are sincerely making attempts to remedy their situations and others with needs as long as funds permit.

While some variation exists between the various types of service providers, the listed needs of those who are homeless were fairly uniform. Most agencies stated that generally they were able to match the needs. The major unmet needs cited were housing, job training/counseling, mental health services, and educations services.

26. Are there any conditions for staying in the shelter (e.g. refrain from smoking, leave part of the day, attend therapy, perform work etc)?

Almost all of the agencies reported conditions for involvement in their programs. Obviously the direct service providers had the most rules but there was a great variability between the programs. Voucher-type programs admitted that while they could not really enforce any restrictions, most request that their guests "be good" by not using alcohol or other drugs. Some did have income restrictions, social security number requirements and require general cooperation. Uncooperative or disruptive persons are usually denied future services.

Direct service providers consistently gave similar responses (though no one provider had all of these restrictions): no alcohol or drugs, no weapons or violence; restrictions on smoking; observance of curfew; be dressed; cleanliness; cooperation; evening prayer meetings; police-record check; or working on individually-tailored goals.

For all groups the most frequent request or requirement was to abstain from alcohol or drug use throughout the provision of services.

27. What is the average length of stay for persons using your shelter?

Persons in Families	Total N=34	DSO N=7 NA/DK=5	DSV N=6	VO N=19	VP N=2
Length of Stay					
Mean	12.5	9	20	6	15
Median	10.7	8	18	2	15

Single Persons	Total N=38	DSO N=11 NA/DK=1	DSV N=6	VO N=19	VP N=2
Length of Stay					
Mean	8.25	9	4	5	15
Median	5.87	4	3.5	1	15

Notes: Some providers supplied numerical estimates while others supplied percentage information. Conversions were made on the basis of the estimated total population served.

Total	All providers
DSO	Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V	Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO	Voucher Providers Only
VP	Voucher and Prevention

When examining the data for this question the median is the more accurate indicator of the average number of days because it adjusts for the few agencies whose policies, funds and abilities permits unusually long extended stays compared to other providers. It is evident that families stay for longer periods of time than single persons.

28. What is the average per diem cost to you to provide the shelter portion of your services (ie not including cost of meals or other services)?

	Total N=38 NA/DK=1	DSO N=11 NA/DK=1	DSV N=6	VO N=19	VP N=2
Average Cost	$15.84	$15.25	$14.01	$20.63	$13.50

Notes:
- Total — All providers
- DSO — Direct Service Providers Only
- DS&V — Direct Service and Voucher Providers
- VO — Voucher Providers Only
- VP — Voucher and Prevention

Only three agencies needed to make an estimate for this answer. One agency had absolutely no idea of the level of their per diem shelter costs. Most agencies had the exact number right down to the penny. As the table shows there is considerable similarity, with voucher only programs being slightly more costly.

29. What proportion of your funding for homeless programs comes from each of these sources?

	Total	DSO	DS&V	VO	VP N=2
Federal Government	6%	7%	12%	2%	5%
State Government	5%	10%	5%	3%	
County Government	6%	11%	9%	3%	
City/Town Government	3%	6%	8%	0%	
Fees Paid by Clients	3%	8%	3%	2%	
Churches or Private Charities	55%	45%	50%	61%	80%
Other Non-Government Sources	21%	13%	13%	29%	15%

Notes:
- Total — All providers
- DSO — Direct Service Providers Only
- DS&V — Direct Service and Voucher Providers
- VO — Voucher Providers Only
- VP — Voucher and Prevention

30. Do you admit individuals with:

	Total N=39		DSO N=12		DSV N=6		VO N=19		VP N=2	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
mental health problems	38	1	12	0	6	0	18	1	2	0
history of alcohol use	39	0	12	0	6	0	19	0	2	0
history of drug use	38	1	12	0	6	0	18	1	2	0
physical disability (wheelchair, deaf blind)	37	2	11	1	6	0	18	1	2	0
developmental disability (eg mental retardation)	39	0	12	0	6	0	19	0	2	0
severe health problems	30	9	7	5	5	1	16	3	2	0
history of abusive behavior	32	7	11	1	3	3	16	3	2	0
current severe mental disturbance/ actively psychotic	7	32	2	9	3	3	2	18	0	2
current threatening or abusive behavior	1	38	0	12	0	6	1	18	0	2
who are intoxicated	3	36	2	10	0	6	1	18	0	2
who are under the influence of drugs	1	38	1	11	0	6	0	19	0	2

Notes:
- Total — All providers
- DSO — Direct Service Providers Only
- DS&V — Direct Service and Voucher Providers
- VO — Voucher Providers Only
- VP — Voucher and Prevention

The persons most frequently not admitted are those who are under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Additionally, those who are currently displaying threatening or abusive behavior or who are currently experiencing severe mental disturbance/actively psychotic.

IV. UNMET NEED

31. On an average night during the past year, how many families and single persons (whom you would normally shelter) did you turn away for lack of space?

	Total	DSO Families N=4, NA/DK=0 Singles N=9, NA/DK=3	DSV N=6 NA/DK=0	VO N=19 NA/DK=0	VP N=2 NA/DK=0
Persons in Families	87(36%)	20	4	63	0
Single Persons	156(64%)	125	3	28	0

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers of people

Total All providers
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Prevention

These figures are quite inflated because they are skewed by one agency that reported an average of 110 turnaways under the DSO category for singles. The data is also skewed by one VO program that reported an average of 60 turnaways of persons in families. Both programs are located in the southern half of Wisconsin. The majority of agencies reported no turnaways on the average.

If turnaways vary by season:	DSO N=3 NA/DK=9	DSV N=1 NA/DK=5	VO N=5 NA/DK=14	VP N=0 NA=2
Total Average Low Season Turnaways	5 (2 Winter, 1 Summer)	2(Fall)	31 (3 Winter)	NA
Total Average High Season Turnaways	7 (2 Winters, 1 Summer)	5(Summer)	74 (2 Summer)	NA

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers of people
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Prevention

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this question is the seasonal variation. In general the "low-season" includes the winter months, with the "high season" occurring in the summer months.

Highest number of turnaways at one time	DSO N=12	DSV N=6	VO N=19	VP N=2
Total	159	41	107	0
Range	0-100	0-35	0-75	0

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers of people
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Prevention

Again the reader is cautioned to remember that the high level at one DSO and with one VO agency skews the data. The ranges are provider in order to better clarify this data. An overwhelming number of agencies - 26 reported never having to turn away persons. Another 7 agencies reported turning away less than 10 persons at one time. Only a couple of providers qualified their low numbers by stating that referral sources might know they are filled and thus persons are turned away before ever reaching the doorstep of the provider. This phenomenon occurs in large cities (like Milwaukee) where a centralized referring agency directs those in need to appropriate sources. This system also operates in smaller areas where frequently it is the police department that refers persons in need to providers. It was thus postulated that "if the police know we are filled or are out of funds they don't even bother to call us."

32. From your knowledge of your catchment area, what would you estimate to be the largest number of people in the area who are in need of shelter at any one time for whom no shelter is available?

	DSO N=8 Dk=4	DS&V N=5 Dk=1	VO N=18 Dk=1	VP N=2
Mean	82.5	11	23	25
Medium	19	13	4	25
Range	0-500	0-25	0-300	0-5

Notes: Total All providers
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Prevention

An examination by county will more clearly describe the unmet service needs as estimated by providers. In interpreting the following table it should be noted that not all counties or agencies are included. It may well be that other key informants would have different or additional estimates based on their particular viewpoint. For examples, police officers in counties with no emergency shelter provision (who would not be included in this survey) would no doubt be called upon to cope with people who become homeless in these counties. These officers would perhaps be able to expand the coverage of the information presented here.

Beloit County	= 0	Marinette County	= 0
Brown County	= 0	Milwaukee County	= 900
Dane County	= 20	Outagamie County	= 43
Douglas County	= 5	Racine County	= 35
Eau Claire County	= 25	Sheboygan County	= 22
Fond du Lac County	= 10	Walworth County	= 19
Kenosha County	= 20	Washington County	= 2
La Crosse County	= 18	Waukesha County	= 0
Manitowoc County	= 0	Winnebago County	= 5
Marathon County	= 0		

Total for counties covered = 1124

33. Where do those people sleep in the community?

The providers listed numerous places where people sleep. The most frequently occurring answer was: cars. Other frequently cited answers included buildings, lobbies, parks, tents, cardboard box, laundromats, everywhere, trash cans, on heat vents, bus depots, under bridges and in garages.

34. When they leave your shelter, what percentage of your clients:

	Total N=36	DSO N=11 NA/DK=1	DS&V N=6	VO N=17 NA/DK=2	VP N=2
a.go to another shelter	336(10%)	47(4%)	98(16%)	186(11%)	5(2.5%)
b.return to the street	467(13%)	103(9%)	32(5%)	330(20%)	2(1.0%)
c.return to housing arrangement from which they came	175(5%)	80(7%)	43(7%)	52(3%)	0(0%)
d.go to detox facility	56(2%)	31(3%)	18(3%)	7(<1%)	0(0%)
e.go to domestic abuse facility	48(1%)	8(1%)	21(4%)	14(<1%)	5(2.5%)
f.go to mental health facility (such as a hospital)	79(2%)	31(3%)	20(3%)	28(2%)	0(0%)
g.go to community mental health facility (e.g. group home)	45(1%)	10(1%)	25(4%)	10(<1%)	0(0%)
h.secure their own permanent housing	2078(60%)	693(64%)	308(51%)	982(58%))	95(92.5%)
i.other	205(6%)	87(8%)	35(6%)	80(5%)	3(1.5%)

Notes: Figures in this table are numbers and percentages of clients
Total All providers
DSO Direct Service Providers Only
DS&V Direct Service and Voucher Providers
VO Voucher Providers Only
VP Voucher and Prevention

Due to staffing and funding constraints many agencies are unable to conduct follow-up activities on their clients. The figures above represent the best estimates providers could glean from their knowledge of their clientele. Sixty percent are thought to secure their own permanent housing. Thirteen percent are believed to return to the streets while another ten percent go to another shelter.

35. Are there other resource or services which need to be developed or expanded to help in addressing the needs of persons who are homeless in your area? What?

The answers to this question were quite varied and thus a summary listing of suggestions is presented by type of service provider. Multiple similar responses are designated by the number of asterisks preceding the statement. This compendium consists primarily of direct quotes as well as abbreviated content with the specific intent of showing not only the diverse thinking among providers but their language which in a large way reflects their attitudes about the people they serve.

Needed Resources or Services

Direct Service Providers Only (N=11, DK=1)

Region	Comment
1,1,2,2,3	*****Safe, affordable, low-income housing.
1,2	**Permanent housing for the mentally ill
1	Housing for chronic alcohol abusers
5	Low income housing for families not in abusive relationships
1	Low income housing for families
1	Single room occupancy hotels
2	Safe houses for psychotic homeless
2	SRO's for SSI recipients
2,2	**Less restrictive general relief policies that address an individual's immediate needs, not eligibility
5	We don't need flop houses
2	Job training and placement services
2	Health care for the uninsured
	A longer term shelter (1-4 months)
1	Jobs
1	More money
1	Start all over. We have to crack the cycle of poverty and not continue to contribute to dependency
2	Less restrictive shelter policies
1	Mental health services especially for alcohol and drug dependents
1	Stable funding
5	More Christian environments where shelters provide help by hitting at the core of problems: the lack of Jesus Christ in their lives
3	Landlords and owners willing to rent to families

Notes 1 = Milwaukee Region
2 = Dane County
3 = Eastern Region
4 = Southeastern Region
5 = Northern Region
6 = Western Region

Low income, safe, decent, housing is mentioned above and beyond all other recommendations. Alternative housing arrangements are suggested quite frequently, but with a variety of target groups mentioned.

Needed Resources or Services

Direct Service and Voucher Providers (N=6)

Region	Comment
4	Another shelter for families
4	Another shelter for single adult males
4	A shelter for single adult females
4	A shelter for single adult pregnant women of a transitional housing nature
3	Single room occupancy hotels, especially for men
2,4,3,4	****Low income permanent housing
	Case coordination
1,3	**Counseling - both crisis and on-going
	Street outreach
1	Health services
1	Meals
1	Clothing
1	Furniture
3	Waiver security deposits

Notes 1 = Milwaukee Region
2 = Dane County
3 = Eastern Region
4 = Southeastern Region
5 = Northern Region
6 = Western Region

Once again the most frequently mentioned need is that of low income permanent housing. Various shelters are proposed in addition to counseling-outreach and fulfillment of basic needs.

Needed Resources or Services

Voucher Providers Only (N=18, DK=1)

Region	Comment
1,5,3,3,3,4,4,4	********Low income, adequate, affordable housing
4	No more emergency housing
6,3	**More shelters
3,4	**More funds extended to existing shelters
6,3,3,4	****More money; tired of the band-aid put them in a hotel approach because this doesn't do much
5,4	**Housing for those on General Relief
4,3	**Centralized services, we're too fragmented
6	Desperate need of another shelter, especially for the "chronics" or "transients"
4	Funds for more standing policy rooms at hotels so there are beds available and at cheaper rates
1	Childcare so welfare mothers can find work or study
3,3	**Mental health care
3	More shelters and services
5	A community kitchen for those on food stamps
4	Coordinated case management to assist with getting people into entitlement programs
4	No, nothing needed
3	More money for gas to assist them to get to relatives or somewhere else where the grass is greener. Especially for large families because we just can't help them
3	Unskilled jobs
4	Money available to assist those facing eviction
4	Money for down payments and security deposits
3	Community support programs, especially for those who are mentally or physically handicapped without resources for medications and who often lack basic living skills
4	Alcohol and drug programs in schools aimed at prevention and early intervention least they become the homeless of the future

Notes 1 = Milwaukee Region
2 = Dane County
3 = Eastern Region
4 = Southeastern Region
5 = Northern Region
6 = Western Region

Once again low income housing leads the way with a large assortment of other suggested needs. These investigators found that the areas most in need are the larger metropolitan areas. Milwaukee, Madison, the Fox River Valley, and LaCrosse counties consistently reported an inability to meet the needs both effectively and appropriately.

Needed Resources or Services

Voucher and Prevention (N=2)

Region	Comment
5	Emergency lodging-another shelter
5	Jobs
5	Increases in the benefits of general relief
5	Repair substandard housing
4	Force landlords to provide energy efficient houses so that utility costs are contained
4	More FEMA money with relaxed laws that permit agencies to utilize the funds as needed
4	More money to keep families in their homes so they don't become homeless before we can help them
4	Advocacy with landlords
4	Secure, stable funding so we can better plan and allocate our resources with forethought rather than so haphazardly

Notes 1 = Milwaukee Region
2 = Dane County
3 = Eastern Region
4 = Southeastern Region
5 = Northern Region
6 = Western Region

These programs suggest the repair and renovation of existing housing. They tend to utilize their funds by working with landlords to readjust payments, security deposits and the like. Rather than place someone in a hotel for a few days, they attempt to keep them in their present residence (if only for one more month) which allows for sufficient time to secure entitlement programs and is viewed as more cost effective.

36. Are there particular resources or services which need to be developed or expanded to help in addressing the needs of persons who are mentally ill and homeless in your area? What?

Needed Resources or Services For people with Mental Illness

Direct Service Providers Only (N=12)

Region	Comment
2	Permanent housing under professional supervision
1,2	**Expanded and continuous mental health care
3	Outreach to those who are choosing to be on the streets rather than wandering the streets scaring people
1,1,4,2	****General outreach
2	Medical services
6,4	**I'm not really qualified to answer that
	Rewrite the whole mental health laws
1	Medications are needed
1,1	**Supervision of medications
2	An SSI SRO
2	Safe Houses
2,4	**There are too few programs and follow-ups of those leaving state hospitals
5	God
2	Public housing for single adults
4	A shelter just to accommodate the mentally ill persons who are homeless
1,1	**More supervised group living
1	Monetary compensation for agencies that have "payeeships" which demand a lot of case management. time and follow-up
1	Decent, low cost apartment buildings with an on-site manager, but not a half-way house

Notes 1 = Milwaukee Region
2 = Dane County
3 = Eastern Region
4 = Southeastern Region
5 = Northern Region
6 = Western Region

General outreach and case coordination is mentioned quite frequently. Housing is noted often but vast variation exists as to what form this housing should take. The regions most vocal are the Milwaukee and Madison areas.

Needed Resources or Services For people with Mental Illness

Direct Service and Voucher Providers (N=4, DK=2:

Region	Comment
4	Nothing special is needed
3	Need to help the chronic "street people" get help
1	Health services
1	Mobile meals
1	Cash grants for items not covered by food stamps, like pampers, tampax, etc.
1	Supervised housing
4	Outreach workers to arrange for housing
4	Affordable, clean housing

Notes 1 = Milwaukee Region
2 = Dane County
3 = Eastern Region
4 = Southeastern Region
5 = Northern Region
6 = Western Region

A range of needs are mentioned from nothing, to housing, with assorted concurrent needs suggested as well. The reader will note the regional variation and even the intra-region discrepancies.

Needed Resources or Services For people with Mental Illness

Voucher Providers Only (N=18, DK=1)

Region	Comment
1	Decent housing
1	Community houses
3,3,4	***I don't know, I'm not qualified to answer
3,4,4,4,4	*****Nothing, there's no problem
4	More shelter funding
3	Affordable mental health services
3,4	**Basic needs - food, clothing, shelter
3	*Good housing just for the mentally ill
4,4,3	***Segregate them out from those who are just poor. Provide them their own special shelters
3	Community support program
3	Intervention to take care of medications, etc.
6	Outreach to get the revolvers and chronics off the streets
3	Centralized services
6	Get ric of the tramps, chronics and vagabonds, put them away. Of course, maybe they like it.

Notes 1 = Milwaukee Region
2 = Dane County
3 = Eastern Region
4 = Southeastern Region
5 = Northern Region
6 = Western Region

The range of responses again varies tremendously, from "we have no mentally ill persons" to "get rid of the tramps, chronics and vagabonds by putting them away somewhere". The Walworth County consistently noted no problems with, and actually an absence of persons who are "mentally ill". Other cities within the same southeastern region however reported having extreme needs for this special population.

Needed Resources or Services For people with Mental Illness

Voucher and Prevention (N=2)

Region	Comment
3,5	***No special needs in this area

Notes 1 = Milwaukee Region
2 = Dane County
3 = Eastern Region
4 = Southeastern Region
5 = Northern Region
6 = Western Region

A Note on 'Attitude'

In the course of this survey it became obvious how frequently some providers wanted to only work with the 'good' clients. The 'good' homeless client tends to be the young, adult, white, verbal, intelligent, sophisticated persons within the ranks of the homeless.

The most neglected people are those individuals experiencing high levels of emotional distress. In this situation it seems of questionable value to debate whether their emotional state is an expression of their homeless condition or if the "psychopathology" contributed to their present state of homelessness. A more telling barrier to securing help, which must be confronted directly, is that the humanistic advocates of moral treatment are, for the most part, not prepared to adapt treatment approaches to those surviving within the community. Many are reticent while others are totally resistant to working with individuals who differ so dramatically from themselves in socioeconomic status, education, and language.

Many members of our communities do not tolerate persons whose experience and current reality differs vastly from their own. People who are homeless encounter this intolerance on a daily basis, from the enforced early-rising hours of some shelters to the studied indifference of the passersby on the street. It seems that the level

of intolerance grows concomitantly with increasing visability and awareness of homelessness.

It is not at all surprising that people who work with the homeless will carry with them their own social attitudes. The low status of working with socially low statured persons may reinforce these social attitudes. The depth of the hostile attitudes of some providers toward there clients can perhaps be gaged by the fact that many are unaware that others might find their attitudes appalling. The reoccurring demeaning, degenerating labels affixed by these providers onto people with problems, converting and relegating them to being problem people, was quite casual. The clients were not people who happen to be homeless, but rather they were "homeless", as if that constitute an individual's entire identity. Providers apparently thought nothing of referring to an individual as a "tramp", a "revolver", "vagabond", a "chronic", a "street skut", "scuzzy", "filthy hobo", a "psycho", or "schizo" to name just a few. The data gathering techniques were not designed to elicit inappropriate terms, rather the providers in question seemed oblivious to the notion that anyone might find their attitudes offensive. It is difficult to believe that providers with such rigid values and beliefs could establish an understanding of these individual's daily realities.

By far, the majority of Wisconsin providers are genuinely warm, caring, empathetic, strong advocates for those who are currently clients and recipients. Luckily the majority of these providers lie within the

larger communities and thus work with the majority of those who are homeless. This does not however, negate the reality that about one-third of the Wisconsin providers hold strong to such biased even prejudicial attitudes. We can only imagine that this 'attitude problem' might be even more widespread than uncovered due the social desirability of 'appropriate answers' inherent in investigations of this type.